UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,755	09/15/2003	Chaunccy W. Griswold	29757/P-892	1541

4743 7590 10/11/2007

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
PANDYA, SUNIT	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,755	GRISWOLD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sunit Pandya	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/4/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to amendments filed August 1, 2007, wherein claims 1, 14-15, 17, 29-32, 45, 51, 55, 62-63 have been amended.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/4/2007 is acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 & 1.98. Accordingly, the examiner has considered the references listed therein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-13, 16-28, 31-41, 44-51, 56-58 & 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hornik et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0152509).

Claims 1, 17, 32, 45, 56 & 64: Hornik et al. discloses of a game play via a gaming apparatus, wherein the gaming apparatus comprises of a value input device to

receive a value input from the player (figure 1, element 22), and causing the first display unit to display a first game (figure 1, element 12, wherein the displayed game is a slot game). Hornik et al. also discloses of selecting one of plurality of player input displays, wherein the display corresponds to the game related to the first game display (figure 4, 9-10, elements 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 68, 70, 72, 76, 78, 80, 82 and also element 28 as well as [0048]), and the second display to display the selected player inputs (figure 1, element 28 being the second display), wherein the player input data is received through touch screen for the game (0021). Hornik et al. also determines the outcome of the game and awards the player accordingly (0024).

Claims 2-3, 18-19, 33 & 46-47: Hornik et al. discloses that the second display unit displays at least one button (figure 4 and 0025, 0036 teach of buttons, which needs to be "depressed" or selected by the player).

Claims 4-9, 20-23, 34-37 & 48-49: Hornik et al. discloses of causing the second display unit to display a background (0025-0026, 0035, wherein the background could be an image, a graphic or a video).

Claims 10, 24, 38, 57 & 65: Hornik et al. discloses the second display unit to display second game display (0026 and figure 4, 0032-0036, wherein the selected one of the plurality of player input displays comprises the second game display).

Claims 11-12, 26-27 & 39-40: Hornik et al. discloses the first display unit to display a bonus game, or an event, while causing the second display unit to display the second game display (0035).

Claims 13 & 28: Hornik et al. discloses of selecting the one of the plurality of player input displays based on player input (figures 1 and 4 and their description thereof).

Claims 16, 31, 41, 44, 50-51, 58 & 66: Hornik et al. discloses of receiving player input data via one button separate from the second display unit (figure 1, element 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14-15, 29-30, 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hornik et al. as applied to claim1-13, 16 above, and further in view of Rothschild et al. (US Patent Publication 2005/0054438).

Claims 14-15, 29-30 & 42-43: Hornik et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including the plurality of player input displays comprising user interfaces unrelated to the game play (figures 9, 10 display historical information which are informative for the player but are not related to the game play), however fails to teach of display unit for displaying a user interface for player tracking information or an interface for ordering a drink, a food item, a ticket to a show, or any other services provided by the casino.

Rothschild et al. teaches of displaying player tracking information as well as information related to player ordering drinks, food, ticket to a show etc (figure 1). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have implemented player tracking and ability to order drinks, thus providing an excellent service to the player and thus increasing player loyalty because the player is encouraged to frequently visit the casino to earn more points on the players card (0005).

7. Claims 52-55, 59-63, 67 & 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hornik et al. (as applied to the claims above) and further in view of Randall et al. (US Patent 6,318,721).

Hornik et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including buttons on the gaming machine for player inputs (figure 1, element 20). However Hornik does not teach of placing plurality of lights beneath the buttons to cause button on the panel corresponding to the selected one to be illuminated and de-illuminate the unselected buttons. Randall et al. teaches of implementing lights beneath the buttons to cause button on the panel corresponding to the selected one to be illuminated and de-illuminate (abstract and col. 2: 24-29). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hornik et al. to include lights beneath the buttons to cause button on the panel corresponding to the selected one to be illuminated and de-illuminate, as taught by Randall et al., thus indicating to the player their selection, so that the player has an opportunity to make any changes if desired.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 8/1/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's arguments that Hornik et al. does not discloses one of a plurality of player input displays, the one player input display corresponding to the one game related to the first game display. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. The response to the applicant's arguments has been provided above in the rejection paragraph #4.

Consequently, the reference Hornik et al, in combination with Rothschild et al. and Randall et al. disclose, the applicant's invention as claimed, and therefore the rejection is maintained.

Examiner's Note

9. Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunit Pandya whose telephone number is 571-272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SP

Robert Pezzuto
Supervisory Patent Examiner
3714